



901 New York Avenue, NW ■ Washington, DC 20001-4413 ■ 202.408.4000 ■ Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL

TO

Name: David P. Rashid
Company: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Fax Number: 571.270.2578
Phone Number: 571.270.1578
Date: June 16, 2008
Subject: Agenda of Topics for Discussion

FROM

Name: Reece Nienstadt
Phone Number: 202.408.4313
Fax Number Verified by:
Total Pages (including cover): 2
Our File No.: 02887.0270-00000

Confirmation Copy to Follow: N

MESSAGE

Examiner Rashid,

At your request, Applicant's representative submits the following list of topics that Applicant's representative would like to discuss during the interview scheduled for June 17, 2008, at 2:00 pm EST.

I. § 103(a) Rejections of Claims 1-20 over *Takane* and *Gleason*

In the non-final Office Action mailed January 17, 2008, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, and 19 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,538,249 to Takane et al. ("*Takane*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,456,899 to Gleason ("*Gleason*"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the grounds for this rejection.

Applicant's representative would like to discuss the various elements in independent claims 1, 7, 11, and 18-20, and review the teachings of *Takane* that have been cited in the Office Action. Further, Applicant's representative intends to identify elements recited in independent claims 1, 7, 11, and 18-20 that are not taught or suggested by *Takane* or *Gleason*.

If there is a problem with this transmission, notify the sender at the number above.

This facsimile is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message by first-class mail to the above address.



901 New York Avenue, NW ■ Washington, DC 20001-4413 ■ 202.408.4000 ■ Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

For example, Applicant's representative would like to discuss the limitation recited in claim 1 of "scan[ning] the image, using the predetermined edge reference data, to detect edge points of the image" (emphasis added). It appears that the Office Action relies on a single step of computing an intensity gradient (i.e., as performed by the Sobel filter) as allegedly constituting both "scanning the image" and generating the "edge reference data." However, Applicant reasons that "scanning the image, using the predetermined edge reference data" cannot include generating the edge reference data for at least the reason that the edge reference data must necessarily be "predetermined" simply in order to "scan the image," as recited in claim 1.

Please let me know if you would like any clarification regarding the interview topics discussed above.

Reece Nienstadt
Reg. No. 52,072

If there is a problem with this transmission, notify the sender at the number above.

This facsimile is intended only for the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone (collect), and return the original message by first-class mail to the above address.